

## Worksheet #1A. SYSTEM LEVEL: TRAVEL RATING SHEET

	STUDY OBJECTIVES	IMPROVE MOBILITY					CONGESTION	SAFETY			
	Evaluation Criteria	Serve 2020 peak pm demand	Improve travel time predictability	Provide flexibility	Reduce travel times for all modes	Reduce SOV % in peak period trips	Provide Effective Connections	Reduce Congestion below current	Improve Safety for all Modes	Totals	Notes: Modifications, Design Guidelines, Additional Information Needs
#	ALTERNATIVE										
	<b>0</b> (No-Action)										
	<b>1</b>										
	<b>2</b>										
	<b>3</b>										
	<b>4</b>										

Rating: 1=POOR 3=Average 5=Excellent

## Worksheet #1B. SYSTEM LEVEL: LIVABILITY & ENVIRONMENTAL RATING SHEET

STUDY OBJECTIVES		IMPROVE LIVABILITY					ENVIRONMENTALLY RESPONSIVE						
#	Evaluation Criteria	Consistency with adopted regional and local policies	Minimize or mitigate neighborhood impacts	Minimize impacts to visual quality	Support vigorous regional and state economy	Environmental Justice	Impacts to water	Impacts to env sensitive areas	Impacts to air quality	Noise Impacts	Indirect Impacts	Totals	Notes: Modifications, Design Guidelines, Additional Information Needs
	<b>0</b> (No-Action)												
	<b>1</b>												
	<b>2</b>												
	<b>3</b>												
	<b>4</b>												

Rating: 1=POOR 3=Average 5=Excellent

## Worksheet #1C. SYSTEM LEVEL: IMPLEMENTATION RATING SHEET

STUDY OBJECTIVES								
	Evaluation Criteria	Public Support	Maximize benefits to costs	Reasonable total costs	Minimize cost to users	Minimize construction Impacts	Totals	Notes: Modifications, Design Guidelines, Additional Information Needs
#	ALTERNATIVE							
	<b>0</b> (No-Action)							
	<b>1</b>							
	<b>2</b>							
	<b>3</b>							
	<b>4</b>							

Rating: 1=POOR 3=Average 5=Excellent

# Citizen Committee Worksheet Recommendations Summary

1/18/2001

		2020	Committee Comments
Alternative it is tested in	MAJOR ELEMENTS		

## DEMAND MANAGEMENT

1,2,3,4	TDM Package	CONSENSUS ITEM	<i>A large majority of citizen committee members feel that TDM should be included in the first phase of improvements, because they consider it a cost effective way to improve mobility. Some members cautioned that only incentive-based TDM measures should be considered. One member, for example, suggested that TDM be user-based, rather than company/corporation based. One member who opposed TDM said that he would rather "divert all money to new lanes."</i>
1	Pricing TDM Package	8 YES, 9 NO, 10 NEED MORE INFORMATION	<i>Committee members were divided on whether pricing should be included in the PPM. While some members oppose congestion pricing under any circumstance, others feel that they need more information on an issue that has yet to be fully defined at a regional level. This alternative focuses on pricing for the purposes of demand management and some members are opposed to pricing for this purpose. However, many of the committee members agree that pricing should be considered as a tool to fund needed infrastructure on I-405.</i>
1,2,3	HOV Express on I-405 with Direct Access Freeway and Arterial Ramps; arterial HOV priority	16 YES, 3 NO	<i>A majority of citizen committee members support for this option as part of 2020 implementation, because they feel it will support HOV utilization. A couple of those individuals feel that 2+ might be considered during early implementation. A minority oppose this concept.</i>

## TRANSIT/HOV

1,2	HCT w/Double transit service within Study Area, transit stations & P& R.	5 YES	<i>Those members supporting this alternative preferred HCT fixed guideway over the BRT .</i>
	Commuter Rail	<i>Most members feel commuter rail offers low ridership relative to its cost. There was some limited support for commuter rail. One member who supports the inclusion of commuter rail said "rail is needed where stop points are</i>	
	Fixed Guideway	<i>A majority of Citizen Committee members do not support fixed guideway. A few members offered a "maybe," saying that such a system could be further evaluated for its ridership potential and its relationship to a regional transit</i>	
	Skip Stop	<i>Most committee members do not support skip stops, although some committee members felt that they could be explored as they tie in to other components of a regional high capacity transit system.</i>	
3	Bus Rapid Transit Service (BRT) w/Double transit service within Study Area, HOV direct access, arterial bus priority treatments, transit stations and P&R.	16 (9 YES AS STATED, 6 YES AS PER THE PMT RECOMMENDATION, WITH 1 EXCLUDING THE BNSF RIGHT OF WAY)	<i>A majority of citizen committee members expressed support for this option as part of 2020 implementation overall. A couple of members said that priority should be given to increased transit service and transit centers, while HOV direct access should have lower or no priority.</i>
4	Bus Service increase of 50% within Study Area, arterial bus priority treatments, transit stations and P&R.	3 YES	<i>Those supporting this option offered a caveat that ridership benefits should be sufficient to support this investment.</i>

## ROADWAY

	FREEWAY		
1,2,3,4	Basic I-405 Improvements	CONSENSUS ITEM	<i>All committee members concurred that these should be included as part of 2020 implementation, and most urged immediate action. One member suggested that it will be particularly important to address flow/merge solutions as part of the early action efforts. One member felt that besides these roadway improvements, there should be no new lanes added.</i>

		2020	Committee Comments
2	Add 1 general purpose lane each direction on I-405 with basic I-405 improvements	4 YES	<i>Most members feel that this option is insufficient to meet future needs, but those who did expressed concerns about environmental impacts of the other options. A couple of members support this option for certain segments, to minimize impacts on homes and businesses along I-405. One member suggested that this option be considered for 2030 implementation.</i>
3	Add 2 general purpose lanes each direction on I-405 with basic I-405 improvements and connecting freeway/arterial capacity	15 YES	<i>A large majority of Citizen Committee members support this option because they feel it meets the capacity needs of the corridor in the most cost-effective way. A majority of members supported exploration of the HOT lane concept, but did not want to include it as part of the preliminary preferred alternative. A few would like to see the 2-GP Lane concept implemented only in certain segments. In addition, a number of committee members stated that this option should be developed in a manner that mitigates impacts on water and fish, homes and businesses. Another expressed the concern that this option may not be consistent with GMA, and could have significant impacts on land use.</i>
4	Add 2 express lanes each direction on I-405 with 1 additional GP lane, basic I-405 improvements and connecting freeway/arterial capacity	3 YES	<i>Those who support this option would like to see it designed in a manner that supports greater general purpose capacity.</i>
2,3,4	SR 167 / I-405 Interchange Improvements with capacity improvements on SR 167	CONSENSUS ITEM	<i>Members supported this option, as part of the first phase of implementation.</i>
2,3,4	Widen SR 167 1 lane each direction to Kent	5 YES	<i>Members supported one new lanes over two because of their concerns about environmental impacts.</i>
4	Widen SR 167 2 lanes each direction to Kent	10 YES, 4 NO	<i>A large majority of members supported this option as part of the first phase of implementation.</i>
	<b>ARTERIAL</b>		
2,3,4	Implement planned arterial improvements	18 Yes, 0 No	<i>All committee members concurred that these should be included as part of 2020 implementation. One member stressed that these improvements will be needed to accommodate transit increases.</i>
3,4	Expand capacity on north-south arterials	14 Yes, 3 No, 1 Maybe	<i>Nearly all committee members supported this option. One member offered conditional support, given assurances that these improvements would respect local comprehensive plans. Another suggested that these improvement be put into place in the 2030 implementation program.</i>

#### OTHER ELEMENTS

	<b>NON-MOTORIZED</b>		
1,2,3,4	Corridor pedestrian and bicycle improvements	CONSENSUS ITEM	<i>Nearly all committee members supported this option. One member offered the advice that the program should focus first on deficient non-motorized connections.</i>
1,2,3	Include Long Trails	15 YES, 4 NO	<i>Most members supported this element. Those opposing said that they feel this option does not offer sufficient transportation benefit to merit consideration. A number of those who supported, offered the caveat that such improvements be implemented "within reason" or that they should be affordable. Some supporters feel that an effort should be made to concentrate on missing links, or connections to a regional system. Other supporters expressed the opinion that the system will be more affordable if it is implemented earlier.</i>
	<b>ITS</b>		
1,2,3,4	Corridor Intelligent Transportation System Improvements	CONSENSUS ITEM	<i>Members supported this option as part of early implementation.</i>
	<b>FREIGHT</b>		
1,2,3	Corridor freight enhancements	CONSENSUS ITEM	<i>members supported this option as part of early implementation. A few qualified their support--some need more information, while others would concentrate on specific segments, or on safety-related improvements.</i>

## Worksheet #2 Sample Recommendation from Committee Member (Prefers Alt 2)

Committee Member: A Friend of 405

Core Alternative Preference: 0 (No Action)\_\_\_ 1\_\_\_ 2 X 3\_\_\_ 4\_\_\_

		2020	2030+	Design Guidelines/Mitigation	Rationale	Additional Information Needs
Alternative it is tested in	MAJOR ELEMENTS					

1,2,3,4	TDM Package	YES		Emphasize Office Employees	Good benefits for reasonable cost	Effects during peak periods
1	Pricing TDM Package		MAYBE			

TRANSIT/HOV						
1,2	HCT w/Double transit service within Study Area, transit stations & P& R.	YES		Add even more transit service		
	Commuter Rail					
	Fixed Guideway	X		Focus on central Area first; minimize impervious surface	Mobility choices; infrastructure needed	
	Skip Stop		Consider when technology available			
3	Bus Rapid Transit Service (BRT) w/Double transit service within Study Area, HOV direct access, arterial bus priority treatments, transit stations and P&R.					
4	Bus Service increase of 50% within Study Area, arterial bus priority treatments, transit stations and P&R.					
1,2,3	HOV Express on I-405 with Direct Access Freeway and Arterial Ramps; arterial HOV priority	YES			Separate carpools from transit	

ROADWAY						
	FREEWAY					
1,2,3,4	Basic I-405 Improvements	YES		Need early start	Essential to meet existing needs	

## Worksheet #2 Sample Recommendation from Committee Member (Prefers Alt 2)

2	Add 1 general purpose lane each direction on I-405 with basic I-405 improvements	YES		Meet design standards; provide improved fish movements through reconstruction	Meets high percentage of daily demand; improves safety; improves congestion	Split out work and nonwork trips; more information on carpool use
3	Add 2 general purpose lanes each direction on I-405 with basic I-405 improvements and connecting freeway/arterial capacity		Buy right-of-way for future expansion			
4	Add 2 express lanes each direction on I-405 with 1 additional GP lane, basic I-405 improvements and connecting freeway/arterial capacity					
2,3,4	SR 167 / I-405 Interchange Improvements with capacity improvements on SR 167	YES		Early action needed	Essential to meet existing needs	
2,3,4	Widen SR 167 1 lane each direction to Kent	YES				
4	Widen SR 167 2 lanes each direction to Kent		Consider for future			
	ARTERIAL					
2,3,4	Implement planned arterial improvements	YES				
3,4	Expand capacity on north-south arterials	YES?	Maybe	Minimize neighborhood disruption; minimize impacts to wetlands; noise	Meets travel demand needs but concerned with impacts	What are effects if arterials not included?

### OTHER ELEMENTS

	NON-MOTORIZED					
1,2,3,4	Corridor pedestrian and bicycle improvements	YES			Important for livability	
1,2,3	Include Long Trails	YES				
	ITS					
1,2,3,4	Corridor Intelligent Transportation System Improvements	YES			Seems to be cost effective; already being implemented in corridor	Need more information about potential benefits
	FREIGHT					
1,2,3	Corridor freight enhancements	YES		Try to separate trucks and cars	Economic vitality of eastside	Where are the major truck flows?